REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of September 26, 2003 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 15-24, 26, 28-32 and 36-56 remain pending in this application.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 15-19 and 28-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 5,727,155 to Dawson ("Dawson"). Claims 20-24, 26 and 36-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Dawson. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 15-19, 36-46 and 56

Dawson is directed to controlling a remote computer system's access to a shared application on a host computer system. Both the host and remote systems share control of the host system, in that they only share applications that the user of the host systems has designated for sharing. The display of an application shared by the host system is duplicated on the remote system. Thus, any modifications to the application by the host system are shown on the remote system. In an unlocked access mode, changes made to the application by the remote system are received and acted upon by the host system, whereas in a locked access mode, attempted modifications to the application by the remote system do not impact the application running on the host system.

The action alleges that Dawson shows all the features of independent claim 1. As amended, claim 1 recites a personal computer; a main display unit coupled to the personal computer, the main display unit configured to receive first information associated with a first application launched by the personal computer and display the first information; and an auxiliary display unit coupled to the personal computer and distinct from the main display unit, the auxiliary display unit configured to receive second information associated with a second application launched by the personal computer, wherein the second information is displayed on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit.

According to Dawson, the display of an application shared by the host system and remote system "is duplicated as shared display 216 on the remote system 220". Col. 6, ll. 54-55; Fig. 2.

While Dawson shows that applications can be displayed on the remote system display 230 outside the shared display 216, these applications are local applications which are executed by the CPU 310 of the remote system 220 and not by the CPU 305 of the host system 300. Col. 6, ll. 58-61; Fig. 3. In contrast to Dawson, the second information associated with the second application launched by the personal computer is displayed on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit as recited in claim 1. According to the claim 1 invention, the main display unit and the auxiliary display unit are configured to respectively receive first information associated with a first application launched by the personal computer and second information associated with the second application launched by the personal computer, respectively, and display the respective information. In Dawson however, information associated with an application launched by the host computer is either displayed only on the host computer or duplicated as a shared display. Thus, Dawson lacks a teaching or suggestion of an auxiliary display unit configured to receive second information associated with a second application *launched by the personal computer*, wherein the second information is displayed on the display of the auxiliary display unit *and not on the main display unit.*

In one aspect, the claim 1 invention provides an auxiliary display unit in a computer system in addition to a main display unit in order to display certain information normally displayed by the main display unit. A benefit which may be realized by this aspect is that application display information can be routed to the auxiliary display unit, so that valuable primary screen display real estate may be made available for use with another application. Dawson does not contemplate a system, which can achieve these results.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinct from Dawson. Claims 2, 3, 5-11, 15-19 and 37-46, which ultimately depend from claim 1, are considered allowable for the same reasons set forth above and further in view of the additional novel features recited therein.

For example, Dawson lacks a teaching or suggestion of the claim 2 feature of the personal computer, the main display unit and the auxiliary display unit being integrated together in a single physical structure. The action takes the implausible position that because Dawson's

host system and remote system are connected by a conventional telephone wire they are somehow integrated together in a single physical structure. However, Dawson shows that the host system and remote system are part of standalone units, separated from each other in two distinct physical structures and not integrated together in a single physical structure. Figure 2 and p. 10, ll. 10-15 of applicants' specification shows and describes an illustrative embodiment of the claim 2 invention where the personal computer is physically integrated with a main display unit 207 and auxiliary display unit 307.

Claim 17 recites that the personal computer is configured to dynamically control which information the second auxiliary display unit receives by determining whether the second auxiliary display unit is capable of providing display functionality for the information. While Dawson describes providing different levels of access to information, Dawson does not provide any teaching or suggestion of dynamically controlling which information the second auxiliary display unit receives by determining whether the second auxiliary display unit is capable of providing the display functionality for the information. Moreover, Dawson is wholly devoid of any teaching or suggestion of determining whether the second auxiliary display unit has sufficient display space available to receive the first or second information as recited in claim 18. To show this feature of claim 18, the action points to col. 10, ll. 37-40 of Dawson. However, this disclosure of Dawson neither teaches nor suggests determining whether sufficient display space is available. Rather this portion of Dawson describes that if the GDI cannot perform a display task directly, then the remote application calls display driver 370 to assist in performing the display task.

Claim 38 recites that the input user interface is configured to receive user authorization information from a user, the user authorization information being processed to determine whether the user is authorized to change a variable associated with the second application. Claim 39 recites that the input user interface is configured to receive user authorization information from a user, the user authorization information being processed to determine a level of interaction with the second application for which the user is authorized. To show the features of claims 38 and 39, the action relies on Dawson's disclosure of access control at col. 7, ll. 2-5. Dawson describes access control, which is set at the host system and which may pertain to the

level of access the remote system may have with respect to an application. Namely, Dawson determines the level of access on an application basis not on a user basis. In contrast, claim 38 and 39 are directed to the input user interface, which is part of the auxiliary display unit, receiving user authorization information from a user and processing the user authorization information to determine 1) whether that user is authorized to change a variable associated with the second application as recited in claim 38 or 2) a level of interaction with the second application for which the user is authorized. Dawson fails to describe, teach or suggest receiving authorization information from a user and determining what that specific user can do with respect to an application.

Claim 46 calls for the auxiliary display unit being physically attachable to a user. The action has failed to identify a teaching or suggestion of this feature.

Claims 28-32

Independent claim 28 is directed to a method for use in a computer system having a host computer, a main display unit coupled to the host computer, and an auxiliary display unit coupled to the host computer, the auxiliary display unit being a standalone unit including a display and an input user interface. The method includes, among other features, displaying first information associated with an active application on the main display unit; displaying a graphical user interface associated with the active application on the display of the standalone auxiliary display unit, and not on the main display unit; receiving an input from a user through the input user interface of the standalone auxiliary display unit, the input requesting second information associated with the active application; and displaying the second information on the display of the standalone auxiliary display unit, and not on the main display unit in response to the input.

As discussed above, according to Dawson, the display of an application shared by the host system and remote system "is duplicated as shared display 216 on the remote system 220". Col. 6, ll. 54-55; Fig. 2. In stark contrast, the claim 28 invention calls for displaying first information associated with an active application on the main display unit and displaying a graphical user interface portion associated with the active application on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit. If the application is a shared application,

Dawson displays the identical content of the application on the host and remote system. If the application is not shared and local to the remote system 220 (run by CPU 310), Dawson shows that the entire application content is only displayed on the display 230 outside of the shared display 216. Col. 6, ll. 54-61; Figs. 2 and 3. Therefore, Dawson lacks a teaching or suggestion of displaying first information associated with an active application on the main display unit and displaying a graphical user interface portion associated with the active application on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit as recited in claim 28. Moreover, Dawson is devoid of a teaching or suggestion of displaying the second information associated with the active application on the display of the standalone auxiliary display unit, and not on the main display unit in response to the input as called for in claim 28.

In an illustrative implementation of the claim 28 invention, a user can insert a CD into the host computer, where the host computer is configured to launch a soft UI applet and route the UI applet for display on the display auxiliary display unit rather than the display screen of the main display unit. Dawson does not even fathom anything remotely similar to such a scenario.

For at least the above reasons, independent claim 28 is patentably distinct from the art of record. Claims 29-32, which ultimately depend from claim 28, are considered allowable for the same reasons set forth above and further in view of the additional novel features recited therein.

Claim 54

Claim 54 calls for a host computer having an operating system and an application stored thereon and configured to run the operating system and launch the application, a main display unit coupled to the host computer; and an auxiliary display unit coupled to the host computer and distinct from the main display unit, the auxiliary display unit configured to receive and display second information associated with a task bar or system tray of the operating system running on the host computer, wherein the second information is displayed on the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit.

As discussed with respect to claim 28, if an application is a shared application, Dawson displays the identical content of the application on the host and remote system. If the application is not shared and local to the remote system 220 (run by CPU 310), Dawson shows that the entire

application content is only displayed on the display 230 outside of the shared display 216. Col. 6, ll. 54-61; Figs. 2 and 3. Therefore, Dawson lacks a teaching or suggestion of an auxiliary display unit configured to receive and display second information associated with a task bar or system tray of the operating system running on the host computer, wherein the second information is displayed on the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit as recited in claim 54.

Claim 55

Regarding independent claim 55, since Dawson does not teach or suggest displaying first information associated with an active application on the main display unit and displaying a graphical user interface portion associated with the active application on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit as recited in claim 28, Dawson necessarily does not provide a teaching or suggestion of a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions including displaying first information associated with a first active application on the main display unit and displaying a graphical user interface associated with a second active application on the display of the standalone auxiliary display unit, and not on the main display unit. Nor does Dawson teach or suggest computer-executable instructions for displaying the second information associated with the application on the display of the standalone auxiliary display unit, and not on the main display unit as called for in claim 55.

Claims 20-24 and 26

Independent claim 20 is directed to a method of controlling the display of information associated with an active application in a computer system having a host computer, and a first display unit and second display unit coupled to the host computer. The claim 20 method includes determining whether the second display unit has available capacity to display information associated with the application, sending the information associated with the application to the second display unit for display when the second display unit has available capacity, and sending the information associated with the application to the first display unit for display when the second display unit has no available capacity to display the information.

Applicants agree with the action's assessment that Dawson does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the step of determining whether the second display unit has available capacity

to display information associated with the application. Nonetheless, the action contends that it would have been obvious to provide the step of determining whether a display unit has available capacity because Dawson indicates that display devices 205 and 225 can be any of a wide variety of conventional devices and one would have been motivated "to include the display unit with the desired capacity."

The action's position makes no sense in the context of the personal conferencing system of Dawson. While Dawson does indicate that the display devices may be any of a wide variety of conventional display devices, Dawson specifies that display device be "a liquid crystal device, cathode ray tube or other display device suitable for creating graphic images and alphanumeric characters". Col. 4, ll. 33-37. Thus, Dawson avoids the need to determine whether the display of a remote system is capable of displaying information by assuming that the wide variety of display devices which can be used with the personal conferencing system are, at minimum, capable of creating graphic images and alphanumeric character (i.e., have the "desired capacity" relied on by the action as motivation). Stated differently, Dawson does not contemplate that the display of the remote system would be incapable of (as opposed to capable of, but prohibited from) displaying information from the host system. Hence, one would not have been motivated to modify Dawson in the manner suggested in the action.

Furthermore, Dawson does not contemplate that even if a remote system were capable of displaying information, at any point in time it may lack available capacity in terms of display real estate, to display information from the host system. According to Dawson, either an application is shared between the host and remote systems and identically displayed on the displays of both the host and remote system or the application is not shared.

For at least the above reasons, applicants submit that one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to modify Dawson in the manner suggested or otherwise to realize the invention of independent claim 20. Claims 21-23 and 26, which ultimately depend from claim 20, are patentably distinct from Dawson for the same reasons as claim 20, and further in view of the novel features recited therein. For example, claim 26 calls for the step of determining to include

determining whether the second display unit has sufficient display space to display the information. As discussed previously, Dawson does not suggest a feature.

Claims 47-53

As amended, independent claim 47 calls for, among other features, a personal computer; a main display unit coupled to the personal computer, the main display unit configured to receive and display first information associated with a first active application on the personal computer; and an auxiliary display unit coupled to the personal computer and distinct from the main display unit, the auxiliary display unit configured to receive second information from an external network associated with a second active application operating on the personal computer. According to claim 47, the auxiliary display unit includes a display for displaying the second information, wherein the second information is not displayed on the main display unit, a processing unit for receiving and processing instructions received from the personal computer, and a modem configured to couple the auxiliary display unit to the external network responsive to the instructions received by the processing unit from the personal computer, without connecting to the external network through the personal computer.

The action alleges that Dawson discloses all the elements of claim 47, but a modem for the remote system. To overcome this deficiency, the action contends that it would have been obvious to use a modem, such as modem 112 for connecting the computer to another computer over a telephone line, only in the remote system.

Notwithstanding the action's contention, Dawson does not describe, teach or otherwise suggest a shared application scenario in which an auxiliary display unit receives second information from an external network associated with an application being run on the personal computer, wherein the second information is not displayed on the main display unit. Namely, the host system in Dawson does not run an application and display information from the application on the display of the remote system. As discussed above, in Dawson identical information is provided to the displays of the host and remote systems in a shared application scenario. Further, one would not have had any incentive to modify Dawson to realize the claim 47 invention including this feature at the time of the present invention.

Moreover, Dawson does not contemplate that its remote system can connect to an external network responsive to instructions received from the host system, without connecting to the external network through the personal computer. At best, one might modify Dawson to provide a modem in the remote system to connect to an external network responsive to instructions from the remote system CPU. However, Dawson is wholly devoid of any teaching or suggestion of a modem configured to couple the auxiliary display unit to the external network responsive to the instructions received by the processing unit from the personal computer, without connecting to the external network through the personal computer as called for in claim 47. Nor, at the time of instant invention, would one skilled in the art have had any motivation to modify Dawson to obtain the invention of claim 47 to include such a feature.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 47 as patentably distinguishable from Dawson. Claims 48-53 are patentably different from Dawson for the same reason as their base claim 47, and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly. All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: December 3, 2003

By: 

Gary D. Fedorochko
Registration No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001